

7/3/72

Dear Gary,

You know my habits. As soon as I can after the mail comes I answer. Your undatable mailing including your letters of the 27 and 28 and carbon of the 28 to Heller have just come in an envelope stamped "FOUND IN SUPPOSEDLY EMPTY EQUIPMENT (not in caps)" & a Mpls postmark of 6/30. The stamp is not cancelled as usual but with a series of parallel black marks. Then there is a regular 6/30 (??) p.m. postmark on the back.

Thanks for the Heller letter. It reminds me of what I have recently addressed differently to Howard in referring to my cultural derivation from the Old Testament.

There is a seeming mysery about Ross. You say he called you "between planes". He told me in Howard's presence that he was going home and would not have time to speak to you in person but would phone. He told the CTIA people he was going to Dallas. And the day he phoned you "between planes", according to Mary's recollection, he appeared there, introduced himself as an old friend of mine, and remained for about a week, with free access to everything, naturally, with this unquestioned intro. If I do not say there has to be something wrong about this, I do say it seems rather strange.

In responding to your self-justification, I intend to address what I think is in your personal interest and what I think you should have and don't. If one may presume to give advice without the scientific credential to one of your discipline, I suggest you explore your own mind in terms of your behavior in all of this, both ethical and moral and in terms of whether or not you acted responsibly. I do not intend to continue this correspondence or dispute. I'm sending a copy to one critic only, Howard, because of the position in which he is. I haven't made up my mind about sending one to Dick. Howard may want to seek separate counsel. I have referred him to Dick. Unless I indicate it below, I will keep the copy I have made for Dick and will send it if you desire. I am not sending any copies of yours but have no objection to your doing whatever you please.

I would appreciate a copy of the covering letter with which the Archives sent you that list. They also sent it to one other of whom I know but not to me. I would suggest with respect to this and my work that you recall a letter Hoch once wrote and carboned you about the transparency of the official efforts to attract the nuts into misuse of what I force out. It might mean more to you in the future than your own unthinking position now will permit. You have not thought this through. Perhaps you think you have. Perhaps, as I would assume, you also believe your argument or logic, whichever you call it.

You should also know that while I have sent no copies of his letter to me, Jerry did respond. He sent Howard a copy, and you should know that your stories are inconsistent on the face of them and that in other respect Jerry lied.

One of the things you do not address is the fact that when I went to Washington to pick you up in January I went into what has now come to pass with you in some detail. I don't see how you can possibly respond without mention of this unless your mind is tricking you or you confess incredible irresponsibility, in the best face I can put on it. None of this was unknown to you, nor was my view of its potential. Or the fact that in some cases perhaps unrecognized objectives of those involved in what has already become a really nasty business in ways I may not go into here and now. The potential for personal hurts in all of this should have been lost upon you least of everyone else because you are a psychologist. I will not elaborate on what you should have anticipated Lil and I would feel-what you knew we would because of the Ned deal. (From that alone, even if I take every word at face value, did you not owe me a call or a letter on this, any kind of dialogue especially because, as you admit, I had given you a copy in confidence? Did you not also owe this to your own integrity?) I am talking about others here, not us.

I not only won't, I can't go into all the aspects you do not and should have considered and don't even claim to have. Let me give you a very simple one that applies to you because you said you were "out of it" and for professional reasons would have to be. In a different context, when I asked her to be on a future coast-to-coast TV show on the subject Sylvia declined saying the same thing. Yet both of you, confessing not to be up to date and neither of you accepting when long before this I asked for a dialogue on the subject, presume that in this obviously most delicate area you need consult nobody, you are the possessors of all the necessary knowledge? Can you really say these things are consistent? In your case it is less justifiable than in Sylvia's, for while you did not respond to my invitation to

a dialogue, we did engage in a lengthy one in January, in person, which is better than by mail, and you were and should have been without illusion about what you were into. And if you forgot all this, as I suppose might, conceivably be the case, although I'd have trouble believing it, does this not again address the question of whether or not you did behave responsibly? Should you not have asked me if there were any potential for harm in this? Can you conceive of anyone giving Cyril access in our interest? You have copies of so many of his letters to me, you know without doubt that in this Marshall is the government's, not the Kennedy agent. Why should the government want someone who will say the things disprove the Warren Report to come out and say it? None of this is new to you. It is in my Ned correspondence, all of which you have from both sides. You further have the benefit of having had a read all of POST MORTEM.

It is no less than total misrepresentation to allege there is any question of asking that you suppress. First of all, I told Cyril the think involved, immediately but in confidence. He also had PM. Second of all, every critic who was here, every reporter who was here, and all those who were not here were invited, had access. There never was ~~any~~ any "suppression" by me and there is no issue of "suppression" by you except as an ex post facto contrivance. This is further ridiculous when you know that it is on file at the Library of Congress in the copyrighted copies of POST MORTEM. Why do you deceive yourself and seek to deceive others, especially me, on this? The only responsible critic who did not see this, Sylvia, refused to. Without ~~a~~ a single exception everyone else did or got a copy from me. So, aside from your arrogance of thought and action, there likewise is no question of Cyril's not having it.

One of the few amusing things in all of this, if I can use that description when I consider the potential, is that you separate Cyril from "buts and irresponsible buffs". Ask Jerry for a dub of his second Long John appearance and consider that the press is briefed on this for when he opens his yap after seeing this stuff.

Moreover, and I do not expect you to consider any other point of view than the self-justifying one, in the interest of purity and integrity, was it not, really, necessary that his examination be untainted? Should what he would say on emerging be pre-determined in any way, by either side? It is wrong for the government and right for us? What are your ethical and moral standards? But if you disagree, and forgetting that he had access to everything I have, including copies of the first two parts of PM and discussion of what he did not have of the last part when none of this was in question, what can you say about a man undertaking this kind of professional and historical obligation when he has not even prepared himself, as of a week ago, with the printed literature? Jesus, what in the hell else does he really need? And if you respond at all, please address how he could on the one hand undertake this and the other not be prepared before asking?

As I skim your letter, much of which I won't dignify for it doesn't warrant it, I become more convinced that you have been at best superficial, have not been honest with us or yourself, and I do hope, although nothing can now be done about it, that you rethink this before anything happens or comes to pass, for in time it will hurt you if you do not.

I do want everything back. I do want to break this off. You do not fully realize how we felt about you. Until Howard, you were the only one I'd really trusted. You did accept certain obligation I specified when I started sending you copies of everything I got. I do not think an honest can could one-sidedly terminate such an understanding, least of all one who knows what you to my knowledge know about so much that involves us. Mention of Ned and Lifton ~~ought~~ be more than enough. You, personally, saw it with and commented on it with Garrison. I am aware that this presents you with certain mechanical and time problems, as I am aware that I can do nothing to enforce it. It is my desire and I have no desire to have any association with anyone I can't fully trust on such work. I regard your record of this as a record of untrustworthiness, arrogance and other things I won't go into. Even genuine feelings of the kind you pretend required something other than silence an ex parte decisions from you. I do not want to confront this again and to the degree possible, I want to avoid it and what is not in your mind or any other underinformed one, the evil possibilities of misuse, something quite separate from rights to any material. But none of you self-anointed omniscient have given this any thought even when it was pressed upon you.

I've been interrupted several times, including at this point. You realize that what I am saying is the equivalent of "Physician, heal thyself". I am suggesting that your probe your own mind of this, realizing that difficult as any such probe is, one by the mind itself

has to be the most difficult. But for this purpose, if you can be honest with yourself, I propose a simple test from your letter of the 28th, the paragraph beginning with the representation of the advice you now say you gave me. Regard it and see your representation here is honest or accurate. Or is it, as I know it is, self-serving. Intent, I think you would tell yourself, is not necessarily the key, but I ask you to ask yourself if it may not, in fact, disclose intent to you if you can detach yourself. Neither part of the first sentence is faithful. Think about it. This is part of what I said was not worth dignifying with response. But I think I should ask you to ask yourself how apt or honest your use of the comparison with buying a newspaper really is.

Not out of context, really, are these words I quote directly from you 27th: "In going over the Ned business the other day I realized that it was worse than I had remembered - I guess that I had seen another side of Ned." Bernethetically, I ask you what side of Cyril you have seen, what, in fact, you really know of him? Your formulation about Ned is untrue. If you will not take my word, read your own letters, including your own explanation of his motive. How can you say this and use that newspaper-buying jazz? But if there is something worse than you have already said, at what point are you going to evaluate your own actions and decisions? We have never chided you for inflicting Ned and that great suffering and work on us, for we never doubted your motive. But ought you not if only now be asking yourself why, without the most complete advance description of those of his problems you then knew? Should I remind you of the case of the philandering shrink? Were you really responsible in sending such a man to me? Did you really think it through? I have, of course, raised the same question with this current mes. How many times, oh Catherine? If I do not doubt the decency of your intent and the hope that it would help me/us, I am ~~now~~ raising a different question, that of your judgement, for that is what is here in question, in addition to what I am not now arguing, integrity.

Inferentially you have accused me of both suppressing and the intent to suppress. I have done more than deny it. I have disproved it. But there is another side of this that I think you might well consider and particularly in terms of suppression and intent. I freely acknowledge the right of anyone possess of money to use or not use it as he sees fit. I suggest, however, that the use or refusal to use is relevant in terms of what is really causing suppression. You say nice things about my "brilliance" and "working around the clock" in a sentence that includes the unrelated, "being close to the archives." It is not my closeness that has led to what I have done. In any genuine sense, Ned, Cyril, Sylvia, Bud, Maggie, Arch and others are closer, for the cost to them of a trip to the Archives was in every meaningful way less than one for me. You well know this. Forget about Maggie and others not mentioned above. If these people, given their pretensions to unselfishness and bringing out the truth had that desire, is it not possible that you can see, ~~xxxx~~ how I would have nothing in my files except personal material that everybody wouldn't be able to know? The whole damned world? So, given the resources of each of us, in any honest assessment, who, really, must assume responsibility for this alleged "suppression"? In case you are not aware of it with Sylvia, she told me on our first meeting that she was so well fixed she had no interest in or concern over money. I believe she also said her salary is tax exempt. You know I could carry this further, as with Garrison.

In my own defense, although I regard it is unnecessary, I remind you that you know me and my record of openness much better than this. Howard will tell you that I have given him an enormous file on Vietnam. I have, in the recent past, given others, in one case a total stranger, complete research for books one of which has a fair prospect of making a movie. You know that I have not only encouraged Paul to do a book in direct competition with one I long planned and have well started and not only told him to come here first and go over everything I have, but I sent you everything I had written. And you even infer such things? Ought you not be asking yourself why you do or how you can?

If I have only by indirection addressed what I regard as my rights in all this, it is not because I do not regard them as real. It is because I am still dominated with the younger one by what, rightly or wrongly, I regard as the obligations of the older ones. You have often heard and have reported the objections of others to what they described (in the perhaps edited versions given me) as my "fatherly" attitude.

You have been a fool and rushed in. I am no angel and I do not fear to tread. But one of the things you have succeeded in making more difficult is any rectification of what is evil that I, I regret I must anticipate alone, will have to undertake.